



PSY 540 Milestone Four Guidelines and Rubric: Peer Review Discussion

Overview

This assignment marks the final milestone related to the final proposal. In this assignment, you will offer a constructive critique of a peer's rough draft of the proposal and respond to a peer's critique of your own proposal. Part of the proposal-writing process in professional settings involves soliciting feedback from trusted colleagues. Gaining outside insights from colleagues allows proposal writers to apply perspectives to their final product that they may not have previously considered.

Through sharing your work with your classmates in this assignment, you will be able to use their valuable input to improve your own proposal. By participating in the peer review process, you will also gain new insights about your proposal and perhaps your understanding of your selected topic.

In Module Six, you will post your rough draft of your final project proposal for your peers to review in the Module Seven discussion. In Module Seven, you will review the essay of one of your peers. Be sure to prioritize posts that do not yet have a response.

You will most likely need to review your peer's proposal several times to complete a comprehensive evaluation. Read the work in its entirety and then jot down your first impressions or add comments in the margins. Then, you will need to read additional times to develop your formal review. Your peer review discussion post should be three to four paragraphs long and address the elements and questions below:

- **Strengths:** What areas of the proposal work well?
- **Areas of Additional Clarification:** What areas of the proposal could benefit from additional clarification?
- **Remaining Questions:** What remaining questions do you have related to your colleague's chosen topic and proposal?
- **Reflection:** Discuss how your peer's work influences or informs your own proposal or your understanding of your topic.

Keep in mind that the intent of your peer review is not to provide your classmate with a number or letter grade. Instead, you are providing written feedback as to the question prompts noted above. This assignment, as well as your response to your colleague's review of your own work, will be graded using the rubric on the following page. If you need additional information as to what to look for in your review of your colleague's essay, refer to the Milestone Three Guidelines and Rubric document.

Keep the following guidelines in mind as you formulate your review. In your review:

- Include constructive feedback offering insights as to how your peer could improve his or her next draft.
- Direct your review at the content of the proposal and not the author.
- Ask clarifying questions whenever possible.

In addition to your initial post offering your review of a peer's proposal, you are also required to respond to your peer's review of your own work. In your response post, consider your peer's feedback and take the opportunity to work through areas noted for additional clarification and to address your peer's questions or explain how the feedback will influence your revisions for your final proposal.

Rubric

Guidelines for Submission: The peer review and accompanying peer review response should take the form of two discussion posts. Your first post will be three to four paragraphs long and will provide one of your peers with feedback. Second, you will respond to the feedback your peer provided on your own draft. This response should be one to two paragraphs long and specifically address questions raised and offer clarification as requested by your reviewer. Both posts must contain proper grammar and spelling and follow APA citations when appropriate.

Critical Elements	Exemplary (100%)	Proficient (90%)	Needs Improvement (70%)	Not Evident (0%)	Value
Strengths	Meets "Proficient" criteria and notes specific examples or passages from the submitted draft	Identifies what areas of the proposal work well and provides supporting explanation	Identifies what areas of the proposal work well, but lacks supporting explanation	Does not identify what areas of the proposal work well	20
Areas for Additional Clarification	Meets "Proficient" criteria and provides specific, actionable recommendations	Identifies areas in need of additional clarification and explains how these clarifications could improve the proposal	Identifies additional clarifications, but recommendations lack specificity and supporting explanations	Does not identify an area in need of additional clarification	20
Remaining Questions	Meets "Proficient" criteria, and questions directly relate to critical elements of the assignment	Poses questions that are relevant to the topic and proposal	Poses questions that are not relevant to the topic or proposal	Does not pose any remaining questions	20
Reflection	Meets "Proficient" criteria and explains connections with concrete examples highlighting similarities and differences	Discusses relevant connections between the peer's proposal, student's own proposal, and student's understanding of the topic	Discusses irrelevant connections between the peer's proposal, student's own proposal, and student's understanding of the topic	Does not discuss connections between the peer's proposal, student's own proposal, and student's understanding of the topic	20
Peer Review Response	Meets "Proficient" criteria, and plans to incorporate feedback are prioritized around the area of greatest need	Response addresses peer's questions and conveys plans to incorporate relevant feedback	Response fails to address all peer's questions or lacks plans to incorporate relevant feedback	Response is not provided	10
Writing (Mechanics)	Initial post and responses are easily understood, clear, and concise using proper citation methods where applicable with no errors in citations	Initial post and responses are easily understood using proper citation methods where applicable with few errors in citations	Initial post and responses are understandable using proper citation methods where applicable with a number of errors in citations	Initial post and responses are not understandable and do not use proper citation methods where applicable	10
Earned Total					100%